

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the indication that the drawings are acceptable, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449, and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document in the Official Action.

Upon entry of the above amendments claim 1 will have been amended, and claims 8-15 will have been presented. Claims 1-15 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

On pages 2-4 of the Official Action, claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over ISHIKAWA (U.S. Patent No. 4,796,965) in view of OKUNO (U.S. Patent No. 4,578,688).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1, as presently amended, includes, inter alia, "the mirror system reflecting back said light beam such that a projection of said light beam on an auxiliary scanning section is incident on said reflection surface for a first time at a first incident angle different from a

second incident angle at which said projection of said light beam is incident on said reflection surface for a second time, said auxiliary scanning section being perpendicular to said main scanning direction; and a blocking member disposed between said deflector and the object surface, said blocking member preventing an unwanted light flux from striking the object surface, the unwanted light flux traveling from said deflector toward the object surface after being deflected by said deflector only once, wherein the difference between the first incident angle and the second incident angle provides separation between a path of the twice deflected light beam and a path of the once deflected unwanted light flux.”

The Examiner has acknowledged that ISHIKAWA lacks any disclosure of the recited blocking member. However, the Examiner points to element 8a of OKUNO as teaching a light blocking member.

As an initial matter, Applicant submits that the single deflection system of OKUNO is not analogous to the dual deflection system of ISHIKAWA. In this regard, Applicant notes that the element 8a in OKUNO clearly does not prevent a once deflected light flux from striking an object surface while permitting a twice deflected light beam to pass. Accordingly, at least due to the disparate nature of such single deflection and dual deflection systems, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide any blocking member in the system of ISHIKAWA based on the disclosure of OKUNO.

Applicant further submits that ISHIKAWA also lacks any disclosure of the difference between a first incident angle and a second incident angle providing separation between a path of a twice deflected light beam and a path of a once deflected unwanted light flux. In this regard, Applicant note that ISHIKAWA lacks any disclosure of once deflected unwanted light flux, much less any disclosure of the difference in incident angles providing separation between light paths of such once deflected unwanted light flux and a twice deflected beam. Applicant further submits that OKUNO lacks any teaching which could be viewed as curing this deficiency in the disclosure of ISHIKAWA.

Accordingly, even assuming, arguendo, that the disclosures of ISHIKAWA and OKUNO could be combined as suggested by the Examiner, Applicant submits that the such a combination could not reasonably be characterized as teaching a mirror system in which the difference between a first incident angle and a second incident angle provides separation between a path of a twice deflected light beam and a path of a once deflected unwanted light flux, nor a blocking member which prevents such once deflected light flux from striking an object surface. Thus, Applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based upon the teachings of ISHIKAWA and OKUNO.

Applicant further submits that claims 2, 3 and 5-7, which are at least patentable due to their dependency from claim 1 for the reasons noted above, recite additional features of

the invention and are also separately patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper at least for each and certainly for all of the above-noted reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and an early indication of the allowance of these claims.

On page 4 of the Official Action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over ISHIKAWA (U.S. Patent No. 4,796,965) in view of OKUNO (U.S. Patent No. 4,578,688), and further in view of SAITO (U.S. Patent No. 5,438,450).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As an initial matter, Applicant submits that claim 4 is at least patentable due to its dependency from claim 1 for the reasons noted above. In this regard, Applicant submits that SAITO lacks any teaching which could be viewed as curing the above-noted deficiencies in the disclosures of ISHIKAWA and OKUNO.

Applicant further submits that claim 4 recites additional features of the invention and is also separately patentable over the prior art of record. In this regard, Applicant submits that none of the applied references teach a blocking member which blocks unwanted light flux while a light beam strikes an optical sensor.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper at least for each and certainly for all of the above-noted reasons. Accordingly,

P23520.A04

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and an early indication of the allowance of this claim.

Applicant submits that newly presented claims 8-15 are also patentable. For example, Applicant notes that independent claim 8 recites a blocking member which prevents a light beam deflected by the deflector only once at the first incident angle from striking the object surface, while permitting a light beam deflected by the deflector a second time at the second incident angle to reach the object surface. Applicant respectfully requests an early indication of the allowance of these claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Entry and consideration of the present amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so.

Any amendments to the claims that have been made in this amendment, which do not narrow the scope of the claims, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered cosmetic in nature, and to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shuichi TAKEUCHI



\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

Daniel B. Moon  
Reg. No. 48,214

March 3, 2005  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191